

Remarks/Arguments:

Independent claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended.

Each of the independent claims is amended to clarify the invention and not to overcome the cited art as will be shown below. Specifically, each independent claim is amended to specify that SMS messages are transmitted over a wireless link in one of a legacy SMS message format or an IP data packet format (over the wireless communication link).

As presently constituted, none of the references, singularly or in combination, teach or suggest a wireless mobile station that can receive SMS messages in an IP data packet format. Such limitation existed previously either implicitly (see claim 1 where the communications are for a mobile station (suggesting wireless communications)) or explicitly. See claim 6 where the claim states that the mobile station includes transceiver circuitry for receiving communication signals over a wireless communication link and that the mobile station receives the SMS messages (presumably through the transceiver circuitry).

The claimed invention, made more clear by the amendments, clearly requires the mobile station to be able to receive SMS messages over a wireless link in an IP data packet format. Collins (6,424,828 B1) shows that the mobile station communicates over a wireless link with a Mobile Service Provider 230 that includes the SMS message block 235 that is coupled to Internet E-Mail Gateway 240 which presumably converts between legacy SMS message formats and IP data packet formats. Collins does not suggest that Mobile Service Provider 230 transmits SMS messages in an IP data packet format over the wireless link to mobile station 210. Geiger et al. (5,987,022) also do not teach transmitting SMS messages over a wireless communication link in an IP data format. Further, as Geiger et al. are not in the art of wireless communications, the Applicants do not believe that Geiger et al. may properly be combined with Collins because there is no suggestion to combine the two references.

As none of the references teach what is required by the claims as presently constituted, it is believed that the grounds of rejection in the official action are moot and will not be addressed accordingly.


Regarding the Interview Summary, the Applicants included a summary in the last filed response. If a summary is still required, the Applicants request that the Examiner phone the undersigned to discuss further. In any event, the Applicants agree with and approve the Summary provided by the Examiner.

The Applicants believe that the claims as previously submitted, as well as the claims as presently constituted, overcome the cited art and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance regarding the same.

Please direct any questions or comments to the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 7, 2004

By: 

James A. Harrison, Reg. 40,401
Garlick Harrison & Markison, LLP
P.O. Box 670007
Dallas, Texas 75367
(214) 902-8100/office
(214) 902-8101/facsimile